

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/676,590

Filing Date: October 1, 2003

Appellant: Sig H. Badt, Jr.

Group Art Unit: 2626

Examiner: Jesse S. Pullias

Title: MULTI-MODAL INPUT FORM WITH DICTIONARY AND
GRAMMAR

Attorney Docket: 129250-002273/US

APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF ON APPEAL

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

September 6, 2010

ARGUMENTS:

A. The Section 103 Rejections Based on Groner and Bissonnette

(i) claim 1

In his opening brief the Appellant took the position that Groner did not disclose the features of a user interface, wherein *upon selection of one field* and receipt of a recognized command spoken by a user, the user interface displays a list of recognized input terms in a pull-down menu *that are appropriate for input into the selected field*. Contrary to the Examiner's position in the Examiner's Answer, Groner does not disclose or suggest these features.

In particular, the Appellant took the position that the pull down menus in Figures 4A and B do not appear to be terms that are "input into a selected field". Appellant maintains this position.

The Examiner appears to reluctantly acknowledge that the menus in Figures 4A and 4B contain navigational commands. Nonetheless, the Examiner appears to take the position that the list of navigational commands in Figure 4B are "appropriate for input into the selected field on the form".

Appellant notes that the claims are directed at a list of recognized input terms that are *appropriate for input into the selected field*, not a form. Perhaps recognizing this, the Examiner states that a navigational command (e.g., the "Group" sub-command that is shown within the pull down menu for the first level command "Arrange") "may be fairly considered to be appropriate for input into field 212 on Figure 4B because it is located within the physical boundaries of the field".

To the extent that the Appellant understands the Examiner's position, the Appellant submits that neither Groner nor the knowledge of one skilled in the art supports the Examiner's position.

Appellant submits that it is clear from Groner that the navigational sub-commands shown already within "field" 212 (i.e., pull down menu 212),

such as the sub-command “Group” are not appropriate for input, or input, into the field/pull down menu 212 because they are already included within the field/pull down menu 212. Appellant is somewhat baffled by the Examiner’s argument because it seems impossible for a navigational sub-command that is already within a pull-down menu to be appropriate for input into such a pull down menu. Appellant is also unaware of any support for the Examiner’s position within those skilled in the art.

Further, first level navigational commands, such as the command “Pen”, that are not included in the sub-command pull down menu 212 are already contained within ./ their own menu or navigational tool bar 214. Thus, these first level commands are also not “appropriate for input, or input, into” the field or tool bar 214.

Nor does Bissonnette make up for the deficiencies of Groner.

(ii) claim 8

Similar to claim 1, Groner does not disclose instructions for “causing [a] user interface to display a list of recognized input terms for *inputting into [a] selected field if* at least one word is recognized as a command”, as in claim 8. Again, Bissonnette does not make up for the deficiencies of Groner.

(iii) claim 15

Turning to claim 15, it includes similar features as claim 1 and 8 though described as a part of a method. For example, claim 15 includes the feature of “...causing a user interface to display a list of recognized input terms for *inputting into a selected field*”. For the reasons set forth above regarding claims 1 and 8, the Appellant submits that Groner fails to disclose the features of claim 15. Nor does Bissonnette make up for the deficiencies of Groner.

Accordingly, the Appellant respectfully requests that the members of the Board reverse the decisions of the Examiner, withdraw the rejections and allow claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 15, 19 and 22-27.

B. The Section 103 Rejections Based on Groner, Bissonnette and Vanbuskirk

Because claims 4, 11 and 18 are dependent on either 1, 8 or 15 and because Vanbuskirk does not make up for the deficiencies of Groner and Bissonnette, the Appellant submits that claims 4, 11 and 18 are patentable over Groner, Bissonnette and Vanbuskirk for the reasons set forth above regarding claims 1, 8 and/or 15.

Accordingly, the Appellant respectfully requests that the members of the Board reverse the decisions of the Examiner, withdraw the rejections and allow claims 4, 11 and 18.

Conclusion:

Appellant respectfully request that members of the Board reverse the decision of the Examiner and allow claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 18 ,19 and 22-27.

The Commissioner is authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3777 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,
Capitol Patent & Trademark Law Firm, PLLC

By: /John E. Curtin/
John E. Curtin, Reg. No. 37,602
P.O. Box 1995
Vienna, VA 22183
(703)266-3330